



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/721,394	11/25/2003	Richard Paul Eckberg	US 138361-1	9014
7590	11/14/2005		EXAMINER	
Kenneth S. Wheelock General Electric Company One Plastics Avenue Pittsfield, MA 01201			BERMAN, SUSAN W	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1711	

DATE MAILED: 11/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/721,394	ECKBERG, RICHARD PAUL
<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
Susan W. Berman	1711	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 August 2005.

2a)  This action is **FINAL**.                            2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## **Disposition of Claims**

4)  Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6)  Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.  
7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_ .

5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)  Other: \_\_\_\_ .

***Response to Amendment***

The objections to claims 1, 7 and 8 are withdrawn.

The rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC section 112, second paragraph, is withdrawn.

***Response to Remarks***

Applicant points out that Eckberg et al teach epoxy-functional polysiloxanes having epoxy groups at positions along the polymer chain as well as in the chain-stopping positions and that Desorcie et al teach the same kinds of polysiloxanes. Applicant claims compositions wherein the epoxy-functional polysiloxane has epoxy groups in the chain-stopping positions and “substantially no functional groups positioned along the silicone polymer”. Applicant argues that the instantly claimed compositions provide unexpectedly stable photocurable compositions curable to adhesive coatings having unique release properties and release performance. Applicant further argues that Eckberg et al do not teach one-part shelf stable compositions.

These arguments are found unconvincing for the following reasons.

Eckberg et al disclose polysiloxanes having as few as one epoxy-functional group along the polymer chain. In the disclosed formulas the subscripts g, h, k, l, n, p, u and z can each be zero. The subscript y for unit “ $D_y^E$ ” can be any positive integer, including 1, 2, etc. Epoxy functional silicones taught by Eckberg et al wherein subscripts g, h, k, l, n, p, u and z are each zero and the subscript y for unit “ $D_y^E$ ” is a relatively small positive integer, such as 1, 2, etc., are considered to be encompassed by the instant claim language.

Applicant argues that the data in Tables 2, 3, 4 and 5 shows improved shelf stability for the instantly claimed compositions. Applicant argues that the shelf stability is a result of reduced crosslinking through chain-stopper groups only. The control example in the specification comprises a polysiloxane having numerous cycloaliphatic epoxy groups along the polymer chain. Eckberg et al disclose

Art Unit: 1711

polysiloxanes having as few as one epoxy-functional group along the polymer chain. Therefore, the control example in the Tables is not considered to represent the closest teaching of Eckberg et al. The control example does not contain an alkylphenol compound (Desorcie et al's compatibilizer). Therefore, it is not clear whether the difference in shelf stability (lower viscosity build) is a result of differences in the epoxysiloxane component or in the absence or presence of an alkylphenol component. The alkylphenol compound would be expected to affect shelf stability in view of the teaching of Desorcie et al that it functions as a compatibilizer. In summary, the data presented is not persuasive because of the omission of the alkylphenol compound in the control composition and because the epoxypolysiloxane in the control composition has numerous epoxy groups along the polymer chain while Eckberg et al teach that any number of epoxy groups, including one or two, for instance, could be present along the polymer chain.

The data in Tables 7 and 9-11 show significant differences in stability of release between the examples according to the instantly claimed invention and the control example. However, the data is not persuasive with respect to the cited prior art for the same reasons set forth above.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claim 1, as amended, the phrase "substantially no functional groups positioned along said silicone polymer" does not clearly recite that the 'functional groups' are epoxy groups or that the "functional groups" are not present along the backbone of the silicone polymer. The phrase 'along the silicone

Art Unit: 1711

polymer" includes terminal position along the polymer. The phrase "functional groups" includes functional groups other than epoxy groups.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Eckberg et al (5,814,679) in view of Desorcie et al (5,010,118). Eckberg et al ('679) disclose co-photocuring carbinol-functionalized silicones and epoxy-functionalized silicones to provide improved release properties to release compositions and superior photocurability. Eckberg et al teach that the carbinol-containing silicones provide a lower release force coating (column 10, lines 1-5). Viscosities of the disclosed epoxy silicones range from 100 to 100,000 cstk and viscosities of the disclosed carbinol-containing silicones taught in Table 1 range from 300-15450 cstk. Thus Eckberg et al disclose compositions wherein the viscosities of the epoxy silicone and the carbinol silicone correspond to those in the instant claims. The compositions disclosed comprise the same iodonium salts as instantly claimed (column 13, lines 21-39). The differences from the instantly claimed compositions are that the epoxy-functionalized silicones are not limited to those having substantially no functional groups positioned along the backbone of the silicone polymer and that Eckberg et al do not teach adding an alkylphenol compound. Desorcie et al disclose analogous compositions comprising an epoxysilicone, a polyarylonium salt and a compatibilizer, wherein the compatibilizer is a mixture of an alkylphenol and an alkane diol.

Art Unit: 1711

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to employ the compatibilizer for an epoxy silicone and iodonium salt comprising an alkylphenol disclosed by Desorcie et al in the compositions comprising epoxy silicones and iodonium salts disclosed by Eckberg et al. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated by an expectation of providing substantially uniform epoxysilicone compositions, as taught by Desorcie et al. The features of the dependent claims are found within the disclosure of Eckberg et al. See US 4,279,717 and US 5,360,833, incorporated by reference to teach epoxy silicones, column 12, lines 57-66, and Tables 2, 7, 11 and 12. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to employ an epoxy-terminated silicone polymer from those taught by Eckberg et al wherein "y" is a small positive integer, thus comprising "substantially no epoxy groups (D<sup>B</sup>) in a position other than the terminal position in the epoxy functional silicone (column 6, lines 5-29). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated by a reasonable expectation of providing a useful release composition selected from the compositions disclosed by Eckberg et al since Eckberg et al teach epoxy functional silicones wherein epoxy groups other than terminal epoxy groups can be any positive number (thus including one or two epoxy groups, for instance). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have expected to control the crosslinking in the product by controlling the amount of epoxy functionality along the silicone chain.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing

Art Unit: 1711

date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan W. Berman whose telephone number is 571 272 1067. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Seidleck can be reached on 571 272 1078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571 273 8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SB  
11/8/2005

  
Susan W Berman  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1711